

REMARKS

This Amendment is filed in response to the Advisory Action dated June 25, 2010 and the final Office Action dated April 14, 2010 for the above-captioned U.S. Patent Application.

Claims 1-19 are pending in the subject application prior to entry of this Amendment.

By the Amendment herewith, Applicant clarifies claim 19 to improve upon the wording of this claim and recite a "processor" and "memory" as supported by, for example, the Figures, and pages 6 and 10 of the specification. This clarification is not made for reasons related to patentability and the full range of equivalents should remain intact. No new issues requiring further search and/or consideration are believed to have been raised by this clarification. However, the Examiner contended in the afore-referenced Advisory Action that this amendment raised such new issues and thus did not enter Applicant's Amendment filed on June 14, 2010.

Accordingly, Applicant resubmits the previously filed Amendment, including the addition of new dependent claims 20-22, to address the afore-referenced Final Office Action. For example, new dependent claims 20-22 are presented to further specify the type of light units as supported by, for example, page 11 of the specification.

Applicant also further clarifies independent claims 1, 9 and 19 to recite that the lights units are located around the display unit, as supported by the original specification, claims and drawings. Claim 4 is thus cancelled.

No new matter is presented by this Amendment.

Thus, the Examiner is respectfully requested to enter and consider the amendments and remarks presented herein, which are believed to place the application in condition for immediate allowance.

Accordingly, upon entry of this Amendment claims 1-3, 5-17 and 19-22 are pending. Of those claims, claims 1, 9 and 19 are independent.

In the outstanding final Office Action, claim 18 is rejected under 35 USC Section 112, first paragraph, as not complying with the written description requirement. Claim 18 also is rejected under 35 USC Section 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections, but has cancelled claim 18 without prejudice in the interest of advancing the prosecution of the subject application. Accordingly, reconsider and withdrawal of these rejections is warranted.

Regarding the rejections based upon art, claims 1-15 and 18-19 are rejected under 35 USC Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoshiki (JP 2003062268) in view of Yokoi (US 4,542,903) and Langlais (US 5,184,956). Dependent claim 16 is rejected under 35 USC Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoshiki in view of Yokoi, Langlais and Kawai (US 20040229691). Lastly, dependent claim 17 is rejected under 35 USC Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoshiki in view of Yokoi, Langlais and Hayashida (US 6,409,596).

The foregoing rejections are respectfully disagreed with, and are traversed below.

Independent claims 1, 9 and 19 recite, in part, respectively:

1. An apparatus comprising ... information-indicating light units are arranged to indicate information concerning a display unit application object located only outside a current view of the display unit ...and the light units are located around the display unit.

9. A method comprising ... controlling the information-indicating light units, which are located around the display unit such that information concerning a display unit application object located only outside the current view of the display unit is indicated by the information-indicating light units.

19. An apparatus comprising a display unit application located only outside the current view of the display unit, wherein the light units are located around the display unit.

The primary reference, Yoshiki, does not teach, for example, that the LEDs 31 would be arranged to indicate information concerning a display unit application object located only outside a current view of a display unit. In Yoshiki, the LED rim always operates with a display unit application object that is located on the screen (e.g. the jumping character).

Moreover, Yoshiki relates to a Pachinko machine (see e.g. “Means for solving the Problem”, each claim relates to a Pachinko machine). The Examiner’s attention is respectfully directed to, for example, <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Pachinko> for more information regarding a Pachinko machine. Attached hereto is page 1 of this citation, which shows a photo of rows of pachinko machines in a pachinko parlour. A pachinko machine is described at page 1 of this citation as resembling a vertical pinball machine with no flippers and a large number of relatively small balls. A Pachinko is instantly recognized by a person of ordinary skill in the art as an application that is not portable. In the Pachinko machines of Yoshiki, there is a ball that travels in the game, which also causes a need to keep the game permanently fixed while in use, and also a display. Yoshiki discloses certain improvements to the display, but it is clear to a person of ordinary skill in the art that Yoshiki’s Pachinko machine is not suited for use as a handheld device that is as compact as possible, such as in Yokoi. Such a modification would go against the main idea of the Pachinko machine and thus against the core of Yoshiki teaching. Yokoi was presented by the Examiner to allegedly show that it is advantageous to make handheld devices more compact.

Accordingly, there is no reason one of ordinary skill in the art would combine the teachings of the afore-cited references in an attempt to arrive at Applicant’s claimed invention.

The addition of Langlais does not cure the shortcomings of the above-cited references and thus does not disclose or suggested Applicant's claims. In particular, Langlais was cited by the Examiner to allegedly disclose information-indicating light units arranged to indicate information concerning a display unit application object located only outside a current view of the display unit. As support, the Examiner refers to Figs. 2A, 2B, 4 and 5, and particularly to the rear view mirrors 20, 25, and 26. Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's analysis.

Applicant respectfully notes that, by default, mirrors include light reflecting material such as a pair of glass and metal foil. Mirrors do not inherently contain information-indicating light units. Langlais teaches that mirrors guide light from a display to the user. There are no information-indicating light units in Langlais, as recited by Applicant in independent claims 1, 9 and 19.

Langlais shows all of the information on a common display. A common display shows both a front view and a rear view (mirror view) by making use of windows to display sections of the display laterally spaced apart from the display. Furthermore, the embodiment of Fig. 5 of Langlais shows a display unit that consists of three adjacent displays. The displays would not relate to any objective presented in the present application, e.g., having as large a display in small host device while being able to present information related to objects outside the display. Further displays around a main display simply would not fit into the space available on Applicant's claimed portable apparatus. Moreover, the driving teaching system of Langlais is not suited for miniaturization without compromising the objective of Langlais to provide an authentic feel for the practising i.e. "simulating the conditions of driving" and that the simulation is "closer to the real conditions of car driving" (col. 1, lines 7 to 19 and lines 27 to 33). Accordingly, a person skilled in the art would not even look for Langlais for guidance.

Moreover, the cited references do not disclose or suggest a portable apparatus wherein the light units are located around the display unit, as recited in each of Applicant's independent claims.

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully asserted that the cited references, whether viewed alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest the subject matter recited in Applicant's independent claims. There also is no reason to combine and modify the teachings of these references in an attempt to arrive at Applicant's claimed subject matter for the reasons set forth above.

Accordingly, as independent claims 1, 9 and 19 are believed to be patentable, all claims depending therefrom, including the newly added claims, also are patentable at least in view of their dependency from an allowable independent claim. Additionally, regarding newly added dependent claims 20-22, it is respectfully asserted that the cited references do not disclose or suggest Applicant's claimed method and apparatus, wherein the light units are located around the display unit and the light units are light emitting diodes or organic light emitting devices.

All issues having been addressed, the subject application is believed to be in condition for immediate allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejections. A Notice of Allowance is therefore earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner have any questions, a call to the undersigned would be appreciated.

Respectfully submitted:

Christine Wilkes Beninati
Christine Wilkes Beninati

July 14, 2010
Date

Reg. No.: 37,967
Customer No.: 29683
HARRINGTON & SMITH, Attorneys at Law, LLC
4 Research Drive
Shelton, CT 06484-6212
Telephone: (203) 925-9400
Facsimile: (203) 944-0245

Attachment: page 1 of <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Pachinko>